arXiv:1403.1391v1 [math.AP] 6 Mar 2014

A Remark on the Leray's Problem on Stationary Navier-Stokes Flows with Large Fluxes in Infinite Cylindrical Domains

Myong-Hwan Ri†

Abstract

We consider Leray's problem on stationary Navier-Stokes flows with arbitrary large fluxes in an unbounded cylinder with several exits to infinity. For a stationary Navier-Stokes flow with large fluxes in the unbounded cylinder in the sense of Definition 1.1, we prove that, if the difference between the pressure of the main flow and the pressure of the Poiseuille flow with the same flux in a branch of the cylinder satisfies some asymptotic boundedness condition at $|x| \to \infty$, see (1.8), then the flow behaves at infinity of the branch like the Poiseuille flow.

2000 Mathematical Subject Classification: 35Q30; 35B35;76D05; 76D07; 76E99
Keywords: Leray's problem; existence; Navier-Stokes equations; large flux; unbounded cylindrical domains .

1 Introduction and main result

Let

$$\Omega = \bigcup_{i=0}^{m} \Omega^i \tag{1.1}$$

be a cylindrical domain of C^2-class of $\mathbb{R}^3$, where Ω^0 is a bounded domain and $\Omega^i, i = 1, \dots, m$, are disjoint semi-infinite straight cylinders, that is, in possibly different coordinates,

$$\Omega^i = \{x^i = (x_1^i, x_2^i, x_3^i) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \ x_3^i > 0, x'^i = (x_1^i, x_2^i) \in \Sigma^i\},$$

where $\Sigma^i \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, is a bounded domain and $\Omega^i \cap \Omega^j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$. Without loss of generality, we assume for each $i = 1, \dots, m$ that the coordinate system which is fixed in Ω^i is such that x'^i, x_3^i denote the variables with respect to the cross section Σ^i and the axial direction of Ω^i, respectively.

Let us consider the stationary Navier-Stokes system

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta U + (U \cdot \nabla)U + \nabla P &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} U &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ U &= 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{1.2}$$

We impose an additional condition for the behavior of the velocity field at infinity as

$$\lim_{|x| \to \infty} U(x) = u_\infty, \tag{1.3}$$

where u_∞ coincides at infinity of each exit $\Omega^i, i = 1, \dots, m$, with the *Poiseuille flow* $\mathbf{v}_i$ in Ω^i corresponding to the prescribed flux Φ_i.

Poiseuille flows in an infinite straight cylinder $\Sigma \times \mathbb{R}$ are often referred to as flows parallel to the axial direction. In the stationary case, the Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{v} = (0, 0, v(x'))$

†: Institute of Mathematics, State Academy of Sciences, DPR Korea. He was supported by 2012 CAS-TWAS Postdoctoral Fellowship with grant number 3240267229

and the corresponding *Poiseuille flow pressure* $\Pi(x_3) = -kx_3 + b$ are simply given by the Poisson equation

$$-\Delta' v = k, \quad v|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0,$$

where, if Σ is a Lipschitz domain, then $k = c(\Sigma)\Phi$, where $c(\Sigma) = \frac{1}{\int_\Sigma |\nabla' g|^2\, dx'}$, $-\Delta' g = 1,\ g|_{\partial\Sigma} = 0$.

Note, due to the solenoidal condition for the fluid, that if U satisfies (1.3), then

$$\int_{\Sigma^i} U \cdot \mathbf{n}^i \, dx'^i = \Phi_i \tag{1.4}$$

should necessarily hold true, where $\mathbf{n}^i$ is the unit vector along the positive axial direction of Ω^i. Moreover, the flux Φ_i should be independent of x_3^i over Ω^i for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \Phi_i = 0 \tag{1.5}$$

should be naturally assumed.

Classical *Leray's problem* is to show whether or not the problem (1.2)-(1.4) will admit a solution. Leray's problem seems to have been proposed, see [1], by J. Leray himself to O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, who in [11] attempted an existence proof under no restrictions on the viscosity.

There is a number of papers dealing with stationary Leray's problem. Fundamental contribution to Leray's problem was made by Amick in [1], where the existence of unique weak solution to (1.2)-(1.4) was proved under a smallness assumption on the total flux $\sum_{i=1}^m |\Phi_i|$, see also [2], [5], [6], [9], [10], and [13]-[17]. However, it has been shown, up to now, that Leray's problem is solved positively only under smallness assumptions on the total flux, and the problem for arbitrary large total flux is known as one of the most challenging problems in the theoretical fluid dynamics; for the Lerays and related problems we refer, in particular, to [7], Chap. VI, Sections 1 and 2, and [8], Chap. XI, Sections 1, 2, 3 and 4, cf. also [3], Introduction and references cited therein for more details.

In this paper, we aim at considering the Leray's problem for large total flux; we present a condition on the flow pressure to allow a weak solution (1.2), (1.4) to behave like Poiseuille flows at $|x| \to \infty$.

In order to explain the main result of the paper, let us give the definition of the weak solution to the system (1.2), (1.4). Let

$$C^\infty_{0,\sigma}(\Omega) := \{\varphi \in C^\infty_0(\Omega)^n : \ \mathrm{div}\, \varphi = 0\}$$

and domains Ω^i_N and $\Omega_{N,N+1}$ be respectively given as

$$\Omega^i_N = \{x \in \Omega^i : x_3^i \le N\},\ \Omega^i_{N,N+1} = \{x \in \Omega^i : N \le |x| \le N+1\},\ \Omega_{N,N+1} = \cup_{i=1}^m \Omega^i_{N,N+1}.$$

Definition 1.1 A vector field $U : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3$ is called a weak solution to (1.2),(1.4) if it satisfies the conditions (i)$\sim$(v):

(i) $U \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}(\bar\Omega)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Omega^i_N} |\nabla U|^2 \, dx \le K_1 N \quad \text{for all } N > 0 \\ &\int_{\Omega_{N,N+1}} |\nabla U|^2 \, dx \le K_2 \quad \text{for all } N > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

with K_1 and K_2 independent of N.

(ii) The variational equation

$$(\nabla U, \nabla \psi) = (U \cdot \nabla \psi, U) \quad \text{for all } \psi \in C^\infty_{0,\sigma}(\Omega) \tag{1.7}$$

holds.

(iii) U vanishes on the boundary $\partial\Omega$.

(iv) Solenoidal condition $\operatorname{div} U = 0$ in Ω holds in the distributional sense.

(v) U satisfies (1.4) in the trace sense.

In [12] the existence of a weak solutions to (1.2), (1.4) in the sense of Definition 1.1 was proved without any smallness assumption on the total flux. Note that if U is a solution to (1.2), (1.4) in the sense of Definition 1.1, then there is an associated pressure P, which is determined uniquely up to a constant difference, such that (U, P) solves the system (1.2) in the sense of distribution. Hence, we shall also call (U, P) a weak solution to (1.2), (1.4).

Even if a weak solution U to (1.2), (1.4) in the sense of Definition 1.1 exists for any large flux, it is not known yet whether the flow U will tend to Poiseuille flows corresponding to given fluxes in each exit of Ω as $|x| \to \infty$.

The main result of this paper is the following statement:

Theorem 1.2 Let Π_i be pressure of Poiseuille flow with flux Φ_i in Ω^i for $i = 1, \dots, m$ satisfying the flux condition (1.5). Let (U, P) be any weak solution to the problem (1.2), (1.4) in the sense of Definition 1.1.

If

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \int_{\Sigma^i} |(P - \Pi_i)(x'^i, N)|\, dx'^i < \infty, i = 1, \dots, m, \tag{1.8}$$

then $U - \mathbf{v}_i \in H^1(\Omega_i), i = 1, \dots, m$, and, in particular, the stationary solution U behaves at $|x| \to \infty$ like Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{v}_i$ in each branch $\Omega_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, of Ω.

Remark 1.3 *Obviously, if U behaves like a Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{v}_i$ at $|x| \to \infty$ in i-th exit of Ω, then the pressure P of the flow also behaves like the corresponding pressure Π_i of the Poiseuille flow and hence the relation*

$$\lim_{|N|\to\infty} \int_{\Sigma^i} (P - \Pi_i)(x'^i, N)\, dx'^i = 0$$

must hold true.

Remark 1.4 *From Theorem 1.2 one can get the following deduction: Suppose a fluid flow $U = (U_1, U_2, U_3)$ (with pressure P and) with nonzero flux Φ_i in each Ω_i satisfies the assumptions of Definition 1.1. Suppose U does not behave at $|x| \to \infty$ like Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{v}_i = (0, 0, v_i)$ (denote its pressure by Π_i) with flux Φ_i in Ω_i for some $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. It is seen that* (1.8) *is equivalent to*

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \Big| \int_1^N \int_{\partial\Sigma^i} \frac{\partial(U_3 - v_i)}{\partial n'}\, dx' \Big| < \infty, \tag{1.9}$$

where n' is the unit outward normal vector at $\partial\Sigma^i$, see (3.29). *We notice that $\int_1^N \int_{\partial\Sigma} \frac{\partial(U_3 - v)}{\partial n'}\, dx'$ is the axial directional component of friction force caused in the part $\Omega^i_{1,N}$ by the velocity perturbation $U - \mathbf{v}_i$.*

Therefore, one may conclude from Theorem 1.2 that if the axial directional component of frictional force (resistance in the flow direction) caused by the perturbation flow from the Poiseuille flow in Ω_i is finite, then the flow U with uniform property as in Definition 1.1 behaves at $|x| \to \infty$ like the Poiseuille flow $\mathbf{v}_i$ in Ω_i.

We use the following notations.

For a domain G of $\mathbb{R}^k, k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $L^r(G), W^{s,r}(G)$, $s > 0$, $1 < r \le \infty$, be the usual Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces on G. The space $H^1_0(G)$ ($W^{1,2}_0(G)$) is the H^1-completion of the set $C^\infty_0(G)$.

As long as no confusion arises, we use the same notations for scalar and vector spaces and for constants, e.g. c, C, appearing in the proofs.

2 Preliminaries on the weak solution

In this section we show some properties of the weak solution (U, P) to (1.2),(1.4). Let $\Phi = \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\Phi_j|$.

Proposition 2.1 Let (U, P) be a weak solution to (1.2), (1.4) in the sense of Definition 1.1. Then, there holds

$$U, \nabla^2 U, \nabla P \in L^r(\Omega_{N,N+1}),\ \|U, \nabla^2 U, \nabla P\|_{L^r(\Omega_{N,N+1})} \le C(r, \Omega, \Phi),\ \forall r \in (1, \infty),\ \forall N \in \mathbb{N},$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent of $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof: Fix an arbitrary index $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$. Without the loss of generality we may assume that the coordinate system x coincides with the one x^i fixed in Ω^i. Given $N \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ let

$$G_N := \Omega^i_N \quad \text{for } N \in \mathbb{N}, \quad G_0 := \emptyset, \quad G_{N,N+k} := G_{N+k} \setminus G_N, k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Note that by (1.6) one has

$$U|_{G_{N,N+1}} \in H^1(G_{N,N+1}), \quad \|U\|_{H^1(G_{N,N+1})} \le K_2, \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{2.1}$$

Now, fix a domain G of C^2-class such that

$$G_{1,2} \subset G \subset G_{0,3}$$

and $\partial G \cap \partial\Omega$ is a strictly interior of $\partial G_{0,3} \cap \partial\Omega$. Then,

$$G_{N,N+1} \subset G^{(N)} \subset G_{N-1,N+2},$$

where $G^{(N)}$ is obtained by shifting the domain G as the distance N in the positive direction of the axis of Ω^i, that is,

$$G^{(N)} := G + \{(0, 0, N)\}.$$

If the boundary of Ω is smooth enough, then one may get $U, P \in C^2(\bar{G}^{(N)})$ by Chap. XI, Theorem 1.1 in [8]. However, since we do not have this smoothness for the boundary, we need a more refined argument for the estimate of (U, P).

In view of the geometry of $G_{N-1,N+2}$, we get by Sobolev embedding theorem and (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} &(U \cdot \nabla)U \in L^{3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2}), \\ &\|(U \cdot \nabla)U\|_{L^{3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})} \le c\|U\|^2_{H^1(G_{N-1,N+2})} \le c_1(\Sigma^i, \Omega, \Phi) \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

with constants c, c_1 depending only on Σ^i and independent of N. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla P\|_{H^{-1}(G_{N-1,N+2})} &\le \|\Delta U - (U \cdot \nabla)U\|_{H^{-1}(G_{N-1,N+2})} \\ &\le c(\|\nabla U\|_{L^2(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|(U \cdot \nabla)U\|_{L^{3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})}) \\ &\le c(\Sigma^i, \Omega, \Phi), \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where the constants are independent of $N \in \mathbb{N}$, since $H^1_0(G_{N-1,N+2})$ is continuously embedded into $L^3(G_{N-1,N+2})$ with embedding constant depending only on Σ^i and independent of N.

Let $P_N = \frac{1}{|G_{N-1,N+2}|} \int_{G_{N-1,N+2}} P\, dx$. Since $(U, P - P_N)$ solves the system

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta U + \nabla(P - P_N) &= -(U \cdot \nabla)U \quad &&\text{in } G, \\ \operatorname{div} U &= 0 &&\text{in } G, \\ U &= 0 &&\text{on } \partial G_{N-1,N+2} \cap \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

[7], Chap. IV, Theorem 5.1 implies $U \in W^{2,3/2}(G^{(N)}), P - P_N \in W^{1,3/2}(G^{(N)})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|U\|_{W^{2,3/2}(G^{(N)})} + \|P - P_N\|_{W^{1,3/2}(G^{(N)})} \\ &\le C_1\big(\|(U \cdot \nabla)U\|_{L^{3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|U\|_{W^{1,3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|P - P_N\|_{L^{3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})}\big) \\ &\le C_1C_2\big(\|(U \cdot \nabla)U\|_{L^{3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|U\|_{H^1(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|P - P_N\|_{L^2(G_{N-1,N+2})}\big) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

with C_1 and C_2 independent of $N \in \mathbb{N}$. In fact, by [7], Chap. IV, Theorem 5.1, C_1 depends only on $G^{(N)}, G_{N-1,N+2}$ and hence

$$C_1 = C_1(G, G_{0,3}), \quad C_2 = \max\{1, |G_{N-1,N+2}|^{1/3}\} = \max\{1, (3|\Sigma^i|)^{1/3}\}$$

since $G^{(N)}$ and $G_{N-1,N+2}$ are obtained by shifting G and $G_{0,3}$, respectively.

On the other hand, since $P - P_N$ has mean value 0 in $G_{N-1,N+2}$, we get by [4], Theorem 1 that

$$\|P - P_N\|_{L^2(G_{N-1,N+2})} \le c\|\nabla P\|_{H^{-1}(G_{N-1,N+2})}, \tag{2.6}$$

where the constant c depends on the diameter of $G_{N-1,N+2}$ and consequently does not depend on N.

Thus, (2.2), (2.3), (2.5) and (2.6) yield

$$\|U\|_{W^{2,3/2}(G^{(N)})} + \|P - P_N\|_{W^{1,3/2}(G^{(N)})} \le C(\Sigma^i, \Omega, \Phi). \tag{2.7}$$

Note that (2.7) holds for the sets G^{N-1} and G^{N+1} as well. Therefore, we have

$$\|U\|_{W^{2,3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|P - P_N\|_{W^{1,3/2}(G_{N-1,N+2})} \le C(\Sigma^i, \Omega, \Phi). \tag{2.8}$$

Repeating the above argument, we get $(U \cdot \nabla)U \in L^q(G_{N-1,N+2})$ and

$$\|(U \cdot \nabla)U, P - P_N\|_{L^q(G_{N-1,N+2})} \le c(q, \Sigma^i, \Omega, \Phi), \quad \forall q \in (1, 3),$$

with constant $c > 0$ independent of N. Hence $U \in W^{2,q}(G^{(N)})$, $P - P_N \in W^{1,q}(G^{(N)})$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|U\|_{W^{2,q}(G^{(N)})} + \|P - P_N\|_{W^{1,q}(G^{(N)})} \\
&\le C_3\big(\|(U \cdot \nabla)U\|_{L^q(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|U\|_{W^{1,q}(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|P - P_N\|_{L^q(G_{N-1,N+2})}\big) \\
&\le C_4,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where C_3, C_4 depend on $q, G_{0,3}, G, \Sigma^i, \Omega, \Phi$. Applying the above argument once again, in view of the continuous embedding $W^{1,q(r)} \hookrightarrow L^r$ $(\forall r \in (1,\infty)\ \exists q(r) \in (1,3))$, we get finally that $U \in W^{2,r}(G^{(N)}), P - P_N \in W^{1,r}(G^{(N)}), \forall r \in (1,\infty)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|U\|_{W^{2,r}(G^{(N)})} + \|P - P_N\|_{W^{1,r}(G^{(N)})} \\
&\le C_5\big(\|(U \cdot \nabla)U\|_{L^r(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|U\|_{W^{1,r}(G_{N-1,N+2})} + \|P - P_N\|_{L^r(G_{N-1,N+2})}\big) \\
&\le C_6,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where C_5, C_6 depend only on $q, G_{0,3}, G, \Sigma^i, \Omega, \Phi$.

The proof of the proposition is complete. ∎

Corollary 2.2 For (U, P) let us assume the same as in Proposition 2.1. Then,

$$\|U, \nabla U\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C(\Omega, \Phi).$$

3 Poiseuille flow-like behavior of fluid flow at $|x| \to \infty$

Let us introduce cut-off functions $\{\varphi_i\}_{i=0}^m$ for Ω such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textstyle\sum_{i=0}^m \varphi_i(x) = 1, \quad 0 \le \varphi_i(x) \le 1 \quad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \\
&\varphi_i \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}^i), \quad \operatorname{dist}(\operatorname{supp}\varphi_i,\ \partial\Omega_i \cap \Omega) \ge \delta > 0,\ i = 0, \dots, m,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where 'dist' means the distance. For $i = 1, \dots, m$ let $\mathbf{v}_i = (0, 0, v_j)$ be the Poiseuille flow with flux Φ_i in Σ^i. We know that the corresponding pressure is given by $\Pi_i = k_i x_3^i + b_i$, see Introduction. Moreover, let $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \tilde{\Pi}_i$ be respectively the zero extension of $\mathbf{v}_i, \Pi_i$ onto Ω.

Let $\mathbf{a}$ be a carrier of the Poiseuille flows $\mathbf{v}_i, i = 1, \dots, m$, such that for all $r \in (1,\infty)$

$$\mathbf{a} \in W^{2,r}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\overline{\Omega}),\ \operatorname{div}\mathbf{a} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega,\ \mathbf{a} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega,\ \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{v}_i \text{ in } \Omega_i \setminus \Omega^0, i = 1, \dots, m. \tag{3.2}$$

In [15], see also [7], Chap. 6, §§1, such a vector field $\mathbf{a}$ was constructed as

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{v}, \quad \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varphi_i \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, \quad \mathbf{z} \in W_0^{2,r}(\Omega^0),$$

Then,

$$\|\mathbf{a}\|_{W^{2,r}(\Omega^0)} + \|\mathbf{a}, \nabla \mathbf{a}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C(\Omega)\Phi, \quad \forall r \in (1, \infty). \tag{3.3}$$

Now, let

$$u := U - \mathbf{a}, \quad p := P - \tilde{P}, \quad \tilde{P} := \sum_{i=1}^{m} \varphi_i \tilde{\Pi}_i. \tag{3.4}$$

Then, (u, p) solves

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta u + (u \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{a} + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla)u + (u \cdot \nabla)u + \nabla p &= f \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \operatorname{div} u &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $f = \Delta \mathbf{a} - (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{a} - \nabla \tilde{P}$. From the construction of the vector field $\mathbf{a}$ and $\tilde{P}$ it is clear that

$$\operatorname{supp} f \subset \Omega^0. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof of the Theorem 1.2: Throughout the proof, we fix $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ and use the same notation as in the proposition 2.1 for domains. Let us assume w.l.o.g that the coordinates x^i coincides with the generic coordinate x and $\Omega^0 \cap G_{1,2} = \emptyset$.

For each $N > 0$ let us introduce a cut-off function $\eta = \eta_N$ such that

$$\eta \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega}), \quad \operatorname{supp} \eta \subset \bar{G}_{N+1}, \quad 0 \le \eta(x) \le 1, \quad \forall x \in \Omega,$$

and for $x \in \Omega^i$

$$\eta(x) = \eta(x_3) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_3 \in (1, N) \\ 0 & \text{if } x_3 \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \cup (N + \frac{1}{2}, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Obviously, we have

$$\eta \mathbf{a} \in W^{2,r}(\Omega) \cap W_0^{1,r}(\Omega^i_{N+1}), \quad \forall r \in (1, \infty).$$

Let

$$u^N := \eta u, \tag{3.7}$$

then, obviously, $u^N \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. In the following we shall show that

$$\|u^N\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \le C(\Omega, \Phi), \quad \forall N \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{3.8}$$

Testing (3.5) with $\eta \mathbf{a}$ yields

$$(\nabla u, \nabla(\eta \mathbf{a})) + ((u \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{a}, \eta \mathbf{a}) + ((\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla)u, \eta \mathbf{a}) + ((u \cdot \nabla)u, \eta \mathbf{a}) - (p, \operatorname{div}(\eta \mathbf{a})) = (f, \eta \mathbf{a}), \tag{3.9}$$

where and unless indicated $(\cdot, \cdot)$ stands for the scalar product in G_{N+1}. By elementary calculation we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\nabla u, \nabla(\eta \mathbf{a})) = (\nabla u^N, \nabla \mathbf{a}) - (\nabla \eta u, \nabla \mathbf{a}) + (\nabla u, \nabla \eta \mathbf{a}) \\ &= (\nabla u^N, \nabla \mathbf{a}) + (\nabla u, \nabla \eta \mathbf{a})_{G_1 \cup G_{N,N+1}} - (\partial_3 \eta u, \partial_3 \mathbf{a})_{G_1} \\ &= (\nabla' u_3, \nabla' v_i)_{G_{1,N}} + (\nabla' u_3^N, \nabla' v_i)_{G_1 \cup G_{N,N+1}} + (\partial_3 u_3, \partial_3 \eta v_i)_{G_1 \cup G_{N,N+1}} \\ &\quad -(\partial_3 \eta u, \partial_3 \mathbf{a})_{G_1} \\ &= (\nabla' u_3, \eta \nabla' v_i)_{G_1 \cup G_{N,N+1}} + (\partial_3 u_3, \partial_3 \eta v_i)_{G_1 \cup G_{N,N+1}} - (\partial_3 \eta u, \partial_3 \mathbf{a})_{G_1}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where we used that

$$(\nabla \eta u, \nabla \mathbf{a})_{G_1 \cup G_{N,N+1}} = (\partial_3 \eta u, \partial_3 \mathbf{a}) = 0$$

and

$$(\nabla' u_3, \nabla' v_i)_{G_{1,N}} = -(u_3, \Delta' v_i)_{G_{1,N}} = -k_i \int_1^N \int_{\Sigma^i} u_3 \, dx' dx_3 = 0.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}((u\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{a},\eta\mathbf{a}) &= (\operatorname{div}(u\mathbf{a}),\eta\mathbf{a})\\ &= -(u\mathbf{a},\nabla\eta\mathbf{a}+\eta\nabla\mathbf{a}) = -(u_3\mathbf{a},\partial_3\eta\mathbf{a}) - (u'\mathbf{a},\eta\nabla'\mathbf{a})\\ &= -(u_3v_i,\partial_3\eta v_i)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}} - (\eta\mathbf{a},(u\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{a})\end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$((u\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{a},\eta\mathbf{a}) = -\frac{1}{2}(u_3v_i,\partial_3\eta v_i)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}. \tag{3.11}$$

Concerning the third term of the left-hand side of (3.9) we have

$$((\mathbf{a}\cdot\nabla)u,\eta\mathbf{a}) = (v_i\partial_3u_3,\eta v_i) = -(v_iu_3,\partial_3(\eta v_i)) = -(u_3,\partial_3\eta v_i^2)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}. \tag{3.12}$$

The fourth term of (3.9) is expanded as

$$\begin{aligned}((u\cdot\nabla)u,\eta\mathbf{a}) &= ((u^N\cdot\nabla)u,\mathbf{a})\\ &= ((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,\mathbf{a}) - ((u^N\cdot\nabla)[(\eta-1)u],\mathbf{a})_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}},\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

and finally for the pressure term we have

$$(p,\operatorname{div}(\eta\mathbf{a})) = (p,\partial_3\eta v_i).$$

Thus we get that

$$((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,\mathbf{a}) = R + (p,\partial_3\eta v_i), \tag{3.14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}R \equiv\ & (f,\eta\mathbf{a})_{G_1} - (\nabla'u_3,\eta\nabla'v_i)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}} - (\partial_3u_3,\partial_3\eta v_i)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}\\ &+(\partial_3\eta u,\partial_3\mathbf{a})_{G_1} + \tfrac{1}{2}(u_3v_i,\partial_3\eta v_i)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}\\ &+(u_3,\partial_3\eta v_i^2)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}} + ((u^N\cdot\nabla)[(\eta-1)u],\mathbf{a})_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

In view of the construction of η and (3.6), we get from Corollary 2.2 that

$$|R| \le c(\Omega,\Phi) \tag{3.16}$$

with $c(\Omega,\Phi) > 0$ independent of N.

On the other hand, u^N solves the system

$$\begin{aligned}-\Delta u^N + (u^N\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{a} + (\mathbf{a}\cdot\nabla)u^N + (u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N + \nabla p = f_1 \quad &\text{in } \Omega,\\ \operatorname{div}u^N = g \quad &\text{in } \Omega,\\ u^N = 0 \quad &\text{on } \partial\Omega,\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

in a weak sense, where

$$\begin{aligned}&f_1 := -\Delta\eta u - 2\nabla\eta\cdot\nabla u + (\mathbf{a}\cdot\nabla)\eta u + (\eta^2-\eta)(u\cdot\nabla)u + \eta u_3\partial_3\eta u,\\ &g := \nabla\eta\cdot u = \partial_3\eta u_3.\end{aligned}$$

From the construction of the cut-off function η, we get

$$\operatorname{supp}f_1 \subset G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}, \quad \operatorname{supp}g \subset G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}$$

and, moreover,

$$\|f_1\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)} \le c(\Omega,\Phi)$$

in view of (1.6) and Corollary 2.2.

Testing the first equation of (3.17) with u^N, we get

$$\|\nabla u^N\|^2_{L^2(G_{N+1})} + ((u^N\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{a},u^N) + ((\mathbf{a}\cdot\nabla)u^N,u^N) + ((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,u^N) - (p,g) = (f_1,u^N). \tag{3.18}$$

The second term in the left-hand side of (3.18) is expanded as

$$((u^N\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{a},u^N) = -((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,\mathbf{a}) - (g\mathbf{a},u^N), \tag{3.19}$$

and the third term as

$$((\mathbf{a}\cdot\nabla)u^N,u^N)=(v_i\partial_3 u^N,u^N)=-(v_i\partial_3 u^N,u^N)=0 \tag{3.20}$$

since v_i depends only on x'. Concerning the fourth term, we get that

$$((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,u^N)=-\frac{1}{2}(gu^N,u^N) \tag{3.21}$$

since $((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,u^N)=-((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,u^N)-(gu^N,u^N)$. Summarizing, we get from (3.18)-(3.21) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\nabla u^N\|^2_{L^2(G_{N+1})}-((u^N\cdot\nabla)u^N,\mathbf{a})\\&=(f_1,u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+(g\mathbf{a},u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+\tfrac{1}{2}(gu^N,u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+(p,g).\end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Adding (3.14) and (3.22) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla u^N\|^2_{L^2(G_{N+1})}&=(f_1,u^N)+R\\&\quad+(g\mathbf{a},u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+\tfrac{1}{2}(gu^N,u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+(p,\partial_3\eta v_i+g).\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

Therefore, in view of the fact that the constant in Poincaré's inequality for G_{N+1} is independent of N and depends only on the diameter of Σ^i, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla u^N\|^2_{L^2(G_{N+1})}&\le c(\Omega)\|f_1\|_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}\|\nabla u^N\|_{L^2(G_{N+1})}+R\\&\quad+(g\mathbf{a},u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+\tfrac{1}{2}(gu^N,u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+(p,\partial_3\eta v_i+g).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|\nabla u^N\|^2_{L^2(G_{N+1})}\le |R|+|R_1|+(p,\partial_3\eta v_i+g)_{G_{N,N+1}}, \tag{3.24}$$

where

$$R_1\equiv c(\Omega)\|f_1\|^2_{H^{-1}(\Omega)}+(g\mathbf{a},u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+\frac{1}{2}(gu^N,u^N)_{G_1\cup G_{N,N+1}}+(p,\partial_3\eta v_i+g)_{G_1}. \tag{3.25}$$

Note that $|R_1|\le c(\Omega,\Phi)$ with $c(\Omega,\Phi)$ independent of N, which together with (3.16) yields

$$\|\nabla u^N\|^2_{L^2(G_{N+1})}\le C(\Omega,\Phi)+(p,\partial_3\eta v_i+g)_{G_{N,N+1}}. \tag{3.26}$$

Finally let us estimate $(p,\partial_3\eta v_i+g)_{G_{N,N+1}}$. Let

$$\bar p(x):=p(x)-\frac{1}{|\Sigma^i|}\int_{\Sigma^i}p(x',x_3)\,dx'.$$

Then, using the Poincaré's inequality, Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&|(p,\partial_3\eta v_i+g)_{G_{N,N+1}}|\\&=\Big|\frac{1}{|\Sigma^i|}\int_N^{N+1}\Big(\int_{\Sigma^i}p\,dx'\cdot\int_{\Sigma^i}\partial_3\eta(v_i+u_3)\,dx'\Big)dx_3+\int_N^{N+1}(\bar p,\partial_3\eta(v_i+u_3))_{\Sigma^i}\,dx_3\Big|\\&\le\frac{|\Phi_i|}{|\Sigma^i|}\Big|\int_N^{N+1}\partial_3\eta\Big(\int_{\Sigma^i}p\,dx'\Big)dx_3\Big|+\int_N^{N+1}|\partial_3\eta||(\bar p,(v_i+u_3))_{\Sigma^i}|\,dx_3\\&=\frac{|\Phi_i|}{|\Sigma^i|}\Big|\int_{\Sigma^i}p(x',N)\,dx'+\int_{G_{N,N+1}}\eta\partial_3 p\,dx\Big|+\int_N^{N+1}|\partial_3\eta||(\bar p,(v_i+u_3))_{\Sigma^i}|\,dx_3\\&\le c(\Sigma^i,\Phi_i)\Big|\int_{\Sigma^i}p(x',N)\,dx'\Big|+c(\Omega,\Phi)\\&\qquad\qquad+c(\Sigma^i)\int_N^{N+1}|\partial_3\eta|\|\nabla' p\|_{L^2(\Sigma^i)}\|v_i+u_3\|_{L^2(\Sigma^i)}\,dx_3\\&\le c(\Omega,\Phi)\Big(\Big|\int_{\Sigma^i}p(x',N)\,dx'\Big|+1\Big).\end{aligned}$$

By the assumption (1.8), there is a subsequence $\{N_k\}\subset\mathbb{N}$ such that

$$N_k\to\infty(k\to\infty),\quad\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\Big|\int_{\Sigma^i}p(x',N_k)\,dx'\Big|<\infty.$$

Hence, we have

$$|(p, \partial_3 \eta v_i + g)_{G_{N_k, N_k+1}}| < C(\Omega, \Phi). \tag{3.27}$$

Thus, we get finally from (3.26) and (3.27) that

$$\|\nabla u^{N_k}\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C(\Omega, \Phi), \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N},$$

yielding (3.8) in view of (3.7). In particular, it follows from (3.8) that $\{u^N\}$ has a subsequence weakly convergent in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ to some $\tilde{u} \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ and hence $\|\tilde{u}\|_{H^1_0(\Omega)} \le C(\Omega, \Phi)$. By the way, due to (3.7), $\{u^N(x)\}$ converges to $u(x)$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega^i \setminus G_1$, which implies $u = \tilde{u}$ for a.a. $x \in \Omega^i \setminus G_1$. Thus we get

$$u \in H^1_0(\Omega), \quad \|u\|_{H^1_0(\Omega)} \le C(\Omega, \Phi).$$

The proof of the theorem is complete. ■

Remark 3.1 *Let us obtain an equivalence condition for* (1.8)*. Consider the third equation w.r.t.* u_3 *in* (3.5)*, that is,*

$$-\Delta u_3 + (u \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{a}_3 + (\mathbf{a} \cdot \nabla)u_3 + (u \cdot \nabla)u_3 + \partial_3 p = f_3$$

in Ω^i *for some* $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$*, which may be simplified as (*$\mathbf{a}_3 \equiv v$*)*

$$-\Delta u_3 + \operatorname{div}(uv) + \partial_3(vu_3) + \operatorname{div}'(u'u_3) + \frac{1}{2}\partial_3(u_3^2) + \partial_3 p = f_3. \tag{3.28}$$

Now, integrating (3.28) *over* $\Omega^i_{1,N}$ *we have*

$$\int_{\Sigma^i} p(x', N)\, dx' - \int_{\Sigma^i} p(x', 1)\, dx' = \int_1^N \int_{\partial\Sigma^i} \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial n'}\, dx' + R_2, \tag{3.29}$$

where n' *denotes the unit outward normal vector at* Σ^i *and* $|R_2| \le C(\Omega, \Phi)$ *in view of Proposition 2.1 and Corollary 2.2.*

Therefore,

$$\Big|\int_{\Sigma^i} p(x', N)\, dx'\Big| < C(\Omega, \Phi) \quad \textit{iff} \quad \Big|\int_1^N \int_{\partial\Sigma^i} \frac{\partial u_3}{\partial n'}\, dx'\Big| < C(\Omega, \Phi). \tag{3.30}$$

References

[1] C.J. Amick, Steady solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in unbounded channels and pipes, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa 4 (1977), 473-513

[2] C.J. Amick and L.E. Fraenkel, Steady solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations representing plane flows in channels of various types, Acta Math. 144 (1980), 81-152

[3] H. Beirão da Veiga, Time-periodic solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in unbounded cylindrical domains: Leray's problem for periodic flows, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 178 (2005), 301-325

[4] M.E. Bogovskii, Solution of the first boundary value problem for the equation of continuity of an incompressible medium, Soviet Math. Dokl. 20 (1979), 1094-1098

[5] R. Farwig, Weighted L_p Helmholtz decompositions in infinite cylinders and in infinite layers. Adv. Diff. Equations 8 (2003), 357-384

[6] M.A. Fontelos and A. Friedman, Stationary non-Newtonian fluid flows in channel-like and pipe-like domains. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 151 (2000), 1-43

[7] G.P. Galdi, An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations, Vol. 1: Linearized steady problems, Springer Tracts in Natural Philosophy, 38, Springer, 1994

[8] G.P. Galdi, An introduction to the mathematical theory of the Navier-Stokes equations, Vol. II: Nonlinear steady problems, Springer Tracts in Natural Philosophy, 39, Springer, 1994

[9] L.P. Kapitanskii,Stationary solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations in periodic tubes. (English Translation) J. Soviet Math. 28 (1985), 689-695

[10] L.P. Kapitanskii and K. Pileckas, On spaces of solenoidal vector fields and boundary value problems for the Navier-Stokes equations in domains with noncompact boundaries. (English Translation) Proc. Steklov Math. Inst. 159 (1984), 3-34

[11] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, Stationary motion of a viscous incompressible fluid in a pipe. Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR 124, 551-553 (1959)

[12] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya and V. A. Solonnikov, Determination of solutions of boundary value problems for stationary Stokes and Navier-Stokes equations having an unbounded Dirichlet integral, J. Sov. Math. 21 (1983), 728-761

[13] S.A. Nazarov and K. Pileckas, On the behavior of solutions of the Stokes and Navier-Stokes systems in domains with a periodically varying section. (English Translation) Proc. Steklov Math. Inst. 159 (1984), 97-104

[14] S.A. Nazarov and K. Pileckas, The Reynolds flow of a fluid in a three-dimensional channel. (In Russian) Liet. Mat. Rink. 30 (1990), 772-783

[15] K. Pileckas, Strong solutions of the steady nonlinear Navier-Stokes system in domains with exits to infinity, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova 97 (1997), 235-267

[16] K. Pileckas, A. Sequeira and J.H. Videman, Steady flows of viscoelastic fluids in domains with outlets to infinity. J. Math. Fluid Mech. 2 (2000), 185-218

[17] M.-H. Ri and R. Farwig, Existence and exponential stability in L^r-spaces of stationary Navier-Stokes flows with prescribed flux in infinite cylindrical domains, Math. Methods Appl. Sci. 30 (2007), 171-199